United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.51

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 51st meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 26 November 2013, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-58257 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.15/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Ms. Rokovucago** (Fiji), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Turkey had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution contained two new elements: a reference to access to affordable and quality health-care services, and a reference to the 2013 special event to follow up efforts made towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals. It also included a paragraph whereby the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its sixty-ninth session the consideration of an appropriate celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the World Summit, in 2015.

3. She drew the Committee's attention to minor drafting changes in paragraphs 20 and 35 of the draft resolution.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.15/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

5. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her country had been engaging bilaterally and multilaterally on the goals set out in the draft resolution, namely poverty eradication, full and productive employment for all and social inclusion. Nevertheless, the draft resolution appeared to be outdated, and its real contribution to the realization of those important goals was somewhat unclear.

6. Her Government was committed to accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, including by investing in national plans to boost agricultural development, and supported the draft resolution's continued attention to the rights of indigenous peoples. It also strongly endorsed the need to promote respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the context of development, and agreed that Governments must respect human rights as they formulated and implemented food, education, labour and health policies. While external economic factors — such as official development assistance, energy price fluctuations, or global economic trends — could affect development, domestic policies also played a critical role in helping to provide opportunities, remove obstacles to broad-based economic growth and address the population's needs. While the draft resolution once again called for action by external institutions and advocated policy space, it seemed to underplay the importance of country-level commitments, and made requests on broad debt relief and other economic issues which would be more appropriately addressed in the Second Committee. Its references to the global financial and other crises were out of date. Her delegation had not blocked the consensus on the draft resolution, but hoped for a genuine debate on social inclusion in the future, involving all regions and addressing the challenges that countries faced in that regard.

7. **Ms. Hampe** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the draft resolution referred to a number of important elements related to social development, such as the interrelated and mutually reinforcing nature of poverty eradication and social integration, full and productive employment and decent work for all, and the commitment to gender equality and the empowerment of women. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that negotiations on the draft resolution had failed to adequately address a number of important concepts related to macroeconomic and financial issues. For the draft resolution to be relevant and useful to policymakers, it must accurately reflect the global economic situation and its implications for social development. By simply reproducing language from the previous year's resolution, the draft resolution failed to capture the full debate on those important issues. The European Union and its member States looked to the Second Committee — which was the appropriate body for addressing financial and economic issues — for guidance on those matters, and hoped that, in the future, more concerted efforts could be made by all Member States to reflect accurately the current understanding of those issues and the impact they had on the core work of the Third Committee.

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.22/Rev.1: Violence against women migrant workers

8. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

9. **Ms. Hernando** (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Seychelles, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

10. She drew attention to minor drafting changes that should be made to the third and fifth preambular paragraphs in order to reflect accurately the language that had been agreed upon in informal consultations.

11. The migration of women was a significant global phenomenon, as women migrant workers were one of the most vulnerable and excluded groups and accounted for about half the people who lived outside their countries of birth, as well as a large share of those who migrated within their countries. Migration could serve to empower women, as it broadened their economic opportunities, promoted their financial independence, and could also foster the equitable, inclusive and sustainable enhancement of human development for migrants, their families, their communities and their countries of origin and destination. Nevertheless, migration could also have adverse consequences: migrant women, especially those working in lower-paid occupations, in respect of which law enforcement was weak, were vulnerable to inhuman treatment and many forms of violence and abuse.

12. She gave an overview of the draft resolution, noting that it contained new elements: it welcomed the entry into force of International Labour Organization Convention No. 189 on decent work for domestic workers, and made explicit reference to the United Nations High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, held in October 2013, as well as the agreed conclusions adopted by the Commission on the Status of Women during its fifty-seventh session.

13. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cameroon, Ethiopia, Grenada and Namibia had also joined the sponsors.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.27/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.27/Rev.1: The girl child

15. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

16. **Mr. Msosa** (Malawi), speaking on behalf of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), said that Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Togo had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. In comparison to the previous year's text, the draft resolution had been streamlined to focus in particular on child-headed households, while also touching on other important themes such as child, early and forced marriages, female genital mutilation and the risk of obstetric fistula.

17. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Andorra, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Germany, Grenada, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Montenegro, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.*

19. **Ms. Kerhuel** (Observer for the Holy See) said that her delegation was concerned that the draft resolution did not reflect a consistent ethic of life, as its use of the expression "sexual and reproductive health" could be misconstrued as including recourse to

abortion, which constituted a menace to human life, particularly to the girl child developing in the womb. Her delegation's reservations in relation to that expression had been clearly and fully set out in the report of the International Conference on Population and Development (A/CONF.171/13/Rev.1), held in Cairo in 1994, and the report of the Fourth World Conference on Women (A/CONF.177/20/Rev.1), held in Beijing in 1995. She recalled that, under the Programme of Action adopted at the Cairo Conference, the use of that terminology did not create any new rights, nor did it imply that abortion was permissible as a method of family planning; rather, the Programme of Action acknowledged that the issue must be determined in accordance with national legislation. Her delegation understood "gender" to mean male and female only, according to the customary and general usage of the term.

20. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that that group of countries was strongly committed to advancing the rights of girls and boys worldwide. As recognized in the draft resolution, more needed to be done to eliminate gender inequalities between girls and boys and to address all forms of discrimination and violence suffered by girls around the world. She highlighted the persistence of harmful practices such as female genital mutilation and cutting, as well as child and early and forced marriages. Girls continued to suffer disproportionately as a result of unintended pregnancies, maternal death and disability, and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV. Ensuring their right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health, including sexual and reproductive health, and access to comprehensive sex education, consistent with their needs and capacities, were critical to support the mental and physical health of girls and to empower them to make informed decisions about their lives. The commitments undertaken by Member States through the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the agreed conclusions of the Commission on the Status of Women, in particular those adopted in March 2013, must be translated into reality. The European Union and its member States would continue to work with all partners in order to unlock the potential and power of girls around the world.

21. **Ms. Furman** (Israel), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, El Salvador, Japan, Palau, Switzerland and Uruguay, said that she welcomed the draft resolution's focus on child-headed households, noting that girls in child-headed households faced particular challenges and vulnerabilities, including in relation to poverty, food insecurity and poor nutrition, limited access to safe water and adequate sanitation, violence, exploitation and difficulties in completing their education. She reaffirmed those countries' strong commitment to combating violence and discrimination against girls, including those living in child-headed households, and agreed that gender mainstreaming was key for achieving gender equality and empowering women and girls.

22. Promoting sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights was of critical importance, as reflected in the outcome documents of the Cairo and Beijing Conferences. Furthermore, the World Health Organization had drawn attention to the many health problems associated with pregnancy during adolescence, including anaemia, malaria, HIV and other sexually transmitted infections; early pregnancy also resulted in higher dropout rates among girls, with long-term implications for the individuals concerned, their families and their communities. The international community could not shy away from the most basic and intimate issues affecting girls all over the world. The upcoming year would be pivotal for renewing the commitments made in Beijing 20 years earlier and for laying the groundwork for the post-2015 development agenda.

23. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution had enjoyed broad support, reflecting the international community's recognition of the need to focus on issues affecting girls, such as discrimination and violence, health, education, poverty and early marriage.

24. Improving the lives of women and girls was crucial. Her delegation highly valued the commitments made at the Cairo and Beijing Conferences and in the outcomes of the corresponding review processes. In that context, ongoing efforts must be made to ensure that policies and programmes were designed to empower young people, particularly girls and young women, to make healthy decisions as they made the transition to adulthood, or were thrust into it through early or forced marriage. Those efforts must include ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health care, which was pivotal to the success of global efforts to enable young women and girls to realize their full potential.

25. Her Government was committed to protecting the rights of women and girls and taking action to address barriers to equal opportunity that might result in disproportionate vulnerabilities. It supported the focus on empowering women and girls as beneficiaries and agents of development. It welcomed the call to support girls' efforts to acquire knowledge, develop self-esteem and take responsibility for their lives, while acknowledging the pre-eminent role of parents and guardians, as well as the role of policies and programmes of governmental and non-governmental organizations, as appropriate. It strongly believed in considering investments that took into account the needs of individual boys and girls, while recognizing that any such action should avoid perpetuating gender stereotypes. Policy initiatives — whether on global health, food security, climate change, economic issues, human rights, peace, or security — were stronger and more successful when women and girls were taken into consideration.

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.30/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.30/Rev.1: Rights of indigenous peoples

26. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

27. **Mr. Llorentty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania and the United States of America had joined the sponsors. The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted after more than 20 years of negotiations, had been a landmark achievement for indigenous peoples throughout the world and had become a key reference for strengthening the individual and collective rights of such peoples. Every effort must be made to ensure the Declaration's full implementation.

28. The draft resolution referred to the preparatory process for the 2014 high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly, to be known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. In addition, it called for Governments, non-governmental organizations and others to continue to contribute to the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations and the Trust Fund for the Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People.

29. He made three oral revisions to the draft resolution. In paragraph 2, the words "and that the Alta outcome document, as well as other proposals made by indigenous peoples, be taken into account when preparing the outcome document of the World Conference" should be added at the end. In paragraph 8, the words "and notes the opportunity to further discuss this matter within the framework of the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly to be known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples" should be deleted. In paragraph 9, the phrase "organizations and institutions and representatives" should be revised to read "organizations, institutions and representatives".

30. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Austria, the Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Montenegro, Poland and Slovenia had also joined the sponsors.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.30/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

32. **Ms. Selk** (France), noting that the draft resolution included a decision to change the title of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations to the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Peoples, referred to the interpretative declaration that her delegation had formulated when the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples had been adopted by General Assembly resolution 61/295. Under French constitutional law, collective rights could not supersede individual rights; nonetheless, that did not prevent the recognition of particular rights for indigenous populations defined on a territorial basis.

33. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation would cooperate with other delegations and the Office of the President of the General Assembly to establish an appropriate mechanism to enable representatives of tribal governments to participate in the upcoming World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. With regard to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, she emphasized that the outcome document of the Global Indigenous Preparatory Conference for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples would be one of many documents taken into account in the drafting of the outcome document to be adopted by Member States at the World Conference.

34. **Mr. Dempsey** (Canada) said that his Government was committed to protecting and promoting the rights of indigenous peoples at home and abroad and

supported the objectives of the 2014 World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. He underlined that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was a non-legally binding document which affected neither customary international law nor Canadian law.

35. **Mr. Preston** (United Kingdom) said that his Government had long supported the economic, social and political development of indigenous peoples around the world. Given that human rights applied equally to all persons, certain groups in society should not benefit from rights that were not available to others. With the exception of the right to self-determination, his delegation therefore did not accept the concept of collective human rights in international law; allowing the rights of a group to supersede the rights of individuals risked leaving some unprotected. His delegation appreciated the fact that the Governments of many States with indigenous populations had helped to protect indigenous peoples and strengthen their political and economic position by granting them various collective rights; it therefore understood any internationally agreed reference to the rights of indigenous peoples to refer to those rights bestowed at the national level.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.45/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.45/Rev.1: The right to privacy in the digital age

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the request in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would give rise to additional requirements of $138,500 under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015, including $30,400 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, for the translation and production of the report in the six official languages, and $108,100 under section 24, Human rights, for general temporary assistance at the P-4 level for six months to obtain appropriate expertise on human rights and surveillance of digital communications and the use of other intelligence technologies. While no provision had been made for the requested activities in the proposed programme budget for 2014-2015, every effort would be made to absorb the additional requirements within the existing resources under sections 2 and 24 of that proposed programme budget. It was therefore expected that, should the draft resolution be adopted, no additional appropriations would be sought from the General Assembly.

37. **Mr. Wittig** (Germany), introducing the draft resolution, said that Belgium, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lebanon, Malta, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Turkey and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. Global challenges in the digital age, such as enhanced surveillance, must be tackled at the global level. While the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights could not have foreseen the technical possibilities of the modern era, its articles 2 and 17, in addition to subsequent jurisprudence, formed a sound basis for the terms of the draft resolution. All interested delegations were invited to participate in the thorough and open follow-up process which would soon be launched in Geneva.

38. **Mr. Patriota** (Brazil), continuing the introduction of the draft resolution, said that Egypt and Tunisia had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution was aimed at triggering a timely and crucial debate on human rights violations that could arise from mass surveillance and the interception and collection of data. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that the debate would demonstrate the ability of the United Nations to keep pace with the rapid evolution of information and communication technology and effectively safeguard human rights both online and offline.

39. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belize, Benin, Burkina Faso, Malaysia, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Suriname and Togo had joined the sponsors.

40. **Mr. Ri** Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that the draft resolution was in line with international public opinion on the recent revelations concerning the mass extraterritorial surveillance operations that had been carried out by the United States of America in violation of the fundamental

principles of national sovereignty and non-interference. The human right to privacy must be strictly respected; such surveillance operations must be terminated to ensure global security and restore trust between States. The views on human rights expressed by the United States of America — which was well known for its illegal prison camps, naval bases and indiscriminate drone attacks on civilians — were clearly nothing but hypocrisy. The United States of America must terminate its espionage operations and take all necessary steps to rectify its human rights violations. For those reasons, his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Percaya** (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that the right to privacy must be protected and promoted in accordance with article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. His delegation welcomed the human rights-based approach taken in the draft resolution, particularly in light of recent revelations concerning the interception of data, including extraterritorial surveillance, which constituted a clear violation of the right to privacy. He expressed satisfaction that the reference to extraterritorial surveillance had been maintained in the draft resolution; while such surveillance might be deemed lawful in certain cases, particularly when used to combat terrorism and other national security threats, such activities must be carried out in strict compliance with international law.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted.*

43. **Mr. Dempsey** (Canada) said that in the digital age, States must ensure that all rights, including the right to privacy and the right to peaceful assembly and association, were respected both online and offline, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Unlawful or arbitrary surveillance activities undertaken against any person within a State's territory and subject to its jurisdiction constituted an infringement of the right to privacy. His delegation rejected the distinction made in the draft resolution between regular and mass surveillance; surveillance operations conducted by Governments to persecute religious minorities and political activists were abhorrent and worthy of international condemnation, regardless of the scale of those operations. Failure to recognize the link between the right to privacy and other fundamental rights, in particular freedom of expression, played into the hands of Governments that monitored and censored Internet activity to silence their critics. His delegation regretted that paragraph 1 of Human Rights Council resolution 20/8 had not been fully reproduced in the draft resolution. All States must ensure security without infringing on civil liberties.

44. **Ms. Burgstaller** (Sweden) said that ensuring freedom on the Internet was a priority of her Government; human rights, including freedom of expression and the right to privacy, must be protected both online and offline. In that regard, her delegation regretted that no reference had been made in the draft resolution to Human Rights Council resolution 20/8. Sweden had established a set of principles which could help Governments ensure full respect for human rights when conducting surveillance operations.

45. **Ms. Hewanpola** (Australia) said that while the Internet and other forms of digital technology were valuable tools for sharing information, enhancing communication, improving access to education and health care and promoting human rights, they could also be used to undermine human rights protection. All rights must be protected both in everyday life and in online environments. The draft resolution demonstrated that the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which Australia had long supported, remained applicable in the digital age.

46. **Ms. Li** (Singapore) said that her delegation understood the right to privacy to mean that no person should be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his honour and reputation, including in the context of digital communications. Her Government viewed recent incidents of cyberhacking in Singapore as a highly serious matter. While her delegation welcomed the thrust of the draft resolution, it regretted that owing to a lack of time, some of its proposals had not been sufficiently considered during the informal consultations.

47. **Mr. Preston** (United Kingdom) said that the digital age provided no excuse for States to shirk their international human rights obligations. His delegation regretted that the late submission of the draft resolution had left insufficient time for thorough discussion of such an important issue. The United Kingdom had a robust, transparent and accountable legal policy framework which governed surveillance operations to

prevent arbitrary or unlawful interference with people's privacy, in line with article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Given that the draft resolution referred to the important link between the right to privacy and freedom of expression, his delegation regretted that the language of paragraph 1 of Human Rights Council resolution 20/8 had not been reproduced in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. His delegation understood the rights and obligations referred to in the draft resolution as those set out in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in particular in its article 2. His delegation looked forward to reading the report to be produced by the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with the request made in the draft resolution.

48. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that the right to privacy and the right to freedom of expression were pillars of her country's democracy. Her delegation reaffirmed its support for the rights set out in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in other international human rights instruments. It understood the draft resolution to be focused on State action and consistent with her country's views on the International Covenant. The United States believed that the right to privacy and freedom of expression must be respected both online and offline; indeed, it had recently sponsored a Human Rights Council resolution to that effect. Although conduct that violated the right to privacy could impede the right to freedom of expression, that did not apply in all cases. Her delegation remained committed to cooperating with all States to promote privacy and freedom of expression online and welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution that respect for freedom of expression required respect for the freedom to seek, receive and impart information. The Internet and other technologies offered innovative ways to protect dignity, combat repression and hold Governments — including that of the United States — accountable for their actions. Citizens must be allowed to use such tools without inappropriate censorship or fear of reprisals, to help protect human rights worldwide.

49. **Ms. Al-Mulla** (Qatar) said that modern technology helped to advance global society by enhancing communication and improving access to information. Her Government recognized the right to privacy and the concept of global digital privacy in its national laws, in accordance with its obligations under the international instruments to which it was a party.

50. **Mr. Llorentty Soliz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that all States had a duty to protect the right to privacy, which was closely linked to human rights, national sovereignty and defence of natural resources. He expressed satisfaction that those issues were being discussed thanks to the actions of Edward Snowden, who was unfortunately being persecuted for having exposed the espionage operations that were being carried out worldwide on an unprecedented scale.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.66)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.66: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

51. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

52. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, the Comoros, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ghana, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sri Lanka and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

53. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, India, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Pakistan, Somalia, Swaziland, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors. The Human Rights Council's Working Group on the use of mercenaries played an important role in continuing the work done by previous Special Rapporteurs on the use of mercenaries, especially in relation to the strengthening of the international legal framework to address the use of mercenaries and related issues such as the regulation of private military and security companies.

54. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

55. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) asked which delegation had requested the vote.

56. **The Chair** said that the vote had been requested by the delegation of the United States of America.

57. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union recognized the adverse impact of contemporary mercenaries on the

length and nature of armed conflicts and condemned any link between mercenaries and terrorist activities.

58. A clear distinction must be drawn between the use of mercenaries and the lawful activities of private military and security companies; the fact that the Working Group on the use of mercenaries was mandated to consider both of those issues led to confusion. Several branches of international law, including law on the use of force, international humanitarian and human rights law, the law of State responsibility and international criminal law, as well as instruments such as the Montreux Document on private military and security companies, could provide a framework for regulating, monitoring and setting professional standards for the activity of such companies. The European Union encouraged the Working Group to remain open-minded regarding possible forms of regulation and oversight of those companies. In the absence of a common understanding on important definitions and approaches to that issue, the States members of the European Union would, as in previous years, vote against the draft resolution.

59. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.66.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Colombia, Fiji, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Switzerland, Tonga.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.66 was adopted by 119 votes to 53, with 9 abstentions.*

61. **Mr. Fernández Valoni** (Argentina) said that his Government fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples subjected to colonial domination and foreign occupation, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). The exercise of the right to self-determination required an active subject, namely a people subjected to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, without which the right to self-determination did not exist. The draft resolution just adopted should be interpreted and implemented in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on decolonization.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.35 and A/C.3/68/L.40/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.35: The right to development

62. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

63. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, China, El Salvador and Senegal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

64. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the text underscored the need for the promotion and necessary implementation of the right to development, in keeping with the Declaration on the Right to Development adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 41/128.

65. Reading out an oral revision to the draft resolution, she said that the text of paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 67/171 should be inserted between paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.35, and the paragraphs should be renumbered accordingly. The new paragraph would thus read, "Supports the realization of the mandate of the Working Group, as renewed by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 9/3 of 24 September 2008, with the recognition that the Working Group may convene annual sessions of five working days and submit its reports to the Council".

66. **Ms. Vadiati** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and making a general statement before the decision, said that the full realization of the right to development and the right of peoples under foreign occupation and colonial domination to self-determination, together with respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, were fundamental for the development of friendly relations among nations.

67. At their Sixteenth Conference of Heads of State or Government, the States members of the Movement had reaffirmed the need to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular the right to development, through constructive international dialogue and cooperation, capacity-building and technical assistance. They had also recognized the negative impact of coercive unilateral economic and financial measures on the realization of the right to development. There was a need for a new global human order to reverse the growing disparity between rich and poor through poverty eradication, employment and social integration initiatives. It was also important to address the effects of the international financial and economic crisis on development. The United Nations human rights machinery should give priority to the right to development, in particular through the elaboration of a convention in that connection. The United Nations and its specialized agencies, funds and programmes should mainstream the right to development in their policies and operational activities and in the policies and strategies of international financial and multilateral trading systems. Accordingly, the Movement welcomed the draft resolution, which represented a genuine attempt to enable the inhabitants of its member countries to fulfil their aspirations for development and prosperity.

68. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

69. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, asked which delegation had requested the vote.

70. **The Chair** said that the vote had been requested by the delegation of the United States of America.

71. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.35, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

72. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.35, as orally revised, was adopted by 148 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.*

73. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that Canada wished to reiterate its support for the concept of the right to development whereby individuals were the main participants and beneficiaries of development.

74. States bore the primary responsibility for ensuring the fulfilment of the right to development. As testimony to its attachment to the issue, Canada had supported the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development, and had been a regular participant in discussions on the matter ever since, including as a member of the Human Rights Council's Working Group on the Right to Development. However, any consideration of a legally binding instrument on the right to development was a cause for concern. Instead of creating new legal obligations, the international community should focus on developing and sharing best practices and on strengthening existing initiatives with a view to promoting the realization of individuals' development potential.

75. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that the United States took a holistic approach to human rights, democracy and development, with a view to promoting universal respect for human rights. States that ensured civil and political liberties and respected the economic rights of individuals had stronger economies than States that denied those rights. Her Government agreed that economic development goals should be pursued with consideration for the needs of present and future generations. While those objectives were broadly aligned with the spirit of the draft resolution, the United States was not prepared to join a consensus on the possibility of negotiating a legally binding instrument on the right to development, and would not accept language that contemplated an international binding legal standard. The draft resolution also included unrelated material on controversial topics that would be better addressed in other forums.

76. Discussion of the right to development should focus on aspects relating to those universal human rights that were normally ensured to every individual by his or her Government. The draft resolution did not adequately address those fundamental concerns.

77. Her Government was an active participant in the Working Group on the Right to Development, in which it endeavoured to foster better implementation of development goals and to harmonize various interpretations of the right to development. Such discussions should also involve expert guidance from civil society and the private sector, and the indicators developed by the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development should also be taken into account. Future Working Group sessions should take up the issue of indicators, as her Government was of the view that such work constituted a part of its mandate.

78. The United States was disappointed that the proponents of the draft resolution and of the corresponding Human Rights Council resolution had consistently refused to consider proposals to incorporate the discussion of those operational

elements. Although the draft resolution did not address her Government's core concerns, the United States would continue to engage constructively with the Working Group on the Right to Development.

79. **Ms. McCarthy** (United Kingdom) said that in 2013 the United Kingdom had spent 0.7 per cent of its national income on international development assistance. While her Government welcomed the improvements that had been made to the text of the draft resolution, its major substantive concerns had not been addressed. States were responsible for creating conditions conducive to development, and a lack thereof should not be used as a pretext for curtailing internationally recognized human rights, including political and civil rights.

80. Under human rights treaties, individual States were responsible for their citizens' development; there was no equivalent obligation between States. The right to development should evolve on a consensual basis and politicization should be avoided. That right should be built on the promotion of and respect for civil, political, economic and cultural rights. Given those considerations, the United Kingdom had voted against the draft resolution; however, her Government would continue to engage constructively with the Working Group on the Right to Development.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.40/Rev.1: Safety of journalists and the issue of impunity

81. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

82. **Mr. Iakovidis** (Greece), introducing the draft resolution, said that Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors.

83. There was a direct link between the safety of journalists and the freedom of expression. The draft resolution reflected the concerns of Governments and civil society with regard to the increasing number of deaths of journalists, media professionals and associated personnel in both conflict and non-conflict situations. Although the United Nations Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity and good practices aimed at protecting journalists were positive steps, increased efforts should be made to ensure that journalists had a safe environment in which to perform their work. The draft resolution condemned all attacks and violence against journalists and media workers and urged Member States to do their utmost to prevent such violence.

84. The draft resolution also highlighted the issue of impunity. In response to the killing of French journalists Ghislaine Dupont and Claude Verlon on 2 November 2013, the draft resolution included the proclamation of 2 November as the International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists.

85. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Benin, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.*

87. **Mr.** Diyar **Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation supported the main objective of the draft resolution and had therefore joined the consensus. However, with regard to paragraph 7, it wished to highlight the fact that the United Nations Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity was not the result of an intergovernmental process. Consequently, it was premature to call for that Plan's implementation.

88. **Ms. Al-Mulla** (Qatar) said that her country's great respect for the work of journalists had led it to join the sponsors of the draft resolution. Journalism had evolved to include input from a variety of sources. It had expanded beyond traditional news reporters and staff, and influenced a significant number of lives through the presentation of information. The work of journalists not only informed public opinion, but also served to encourage local and international dialogue, highlight global diversity and advance social development.

89. Her Government welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution because it attested to the international community's appreciation for the work of journalists and determination to take the necessary steps to safeguard their role as responsible leaders in promoting and protecting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

A/C.3/68/SR.52

Readex
Fiche

United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.52

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 52nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 26 November 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice

Agenda item 109: International drug control

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-58456 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (A/C.3/68/L.47, A/C.3/68/L.52/Rev.1, A/C.3/68/L.58, A/C.3/68/L.59, A/C.3/68/L.60/Rev.1, A/C.3/68/L.61/Rev.1, A/C.3/68/L.62/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.74/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt) said that Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Burundi, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

3. The draft resolution was an attempt to address the correlation between globalization and the global financial crisis, on the one hand, and the realization of all human rights, on the other. The text was pertinent to the post-2015 development agenda, as it emphasized that development should be at the centre of the international economic agenda and that narrowing the gap between rich and poor was essential for the full enjoyment of all human rights. It also urged transnational corporations to conduct their business operations in a responsible manner.

4. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries wished to join the list of sponsors: Belarus, Belize, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Niger, Senegal, United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

5. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47.

6. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt) asked which delegation had requested the recorded vote.

7. **The Chair** said that the recorded vote had been requested by the delegation of the United States.

8. **Mrs. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union acknowledged that globalization could affect the full enjoyment of some human rights but that its impact should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The draft resolution, however, generalized the problem by claiming that globalization had an impact on all human rights. It also focused almost exclusively on the negative aspects of globalization and ignored the positive ones, such as its potential for addressing acute problems such as extreme poverty. European Union member States would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

9. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47 was adopted by 112 votes to 52, with no abstentions.*[1]

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.52/Rev.1: United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region

11. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had programme budget implications, as contained in document A/C.3/68/L.74/Rev.1.

12. **Ms. Al-Mulla** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution was a response to the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region and proposed action for the implementation of his recommendations. Increasing demand for the services of the Centre indicated that regional cooperation was central for advancing the promotion and protection of human rights.

13. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Comoros, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger and Nigeria had also joined the sponsors.

14. **Ms. Ali** (Bahrain), speaking on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council, said that the Centre was very important with regard to the human rights mandate and helped non-governmental organizations working in the field of human rights. The Centre had promoted human rights awareness in her region, and consequently her delegation would support the resolution.

15. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.52/Rev.1.

16. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Qatari delegation had once again contravened the simplest procedural matters in the work of the Committee by presenting to the Third Committee a draft resolution pertaining to budgetary matters that should be considered by the Fifth Committee. Before any discussion of allocating United Nations budgetary funds took place, the mandate, objectives, activities and achievements of the Centre must be examined, something that had yet to be done since its creation in 2005, indicating an absence of transparency in the process. Moreover, Qatar had pledged to cover the Centre's expenses when it had offered to host it. Against that backdrop, her delegation was mystified by Qatar's attempt to obtain funding for the Centre from the United Nations budget, particularly given the ongoing financial crisis of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Organization's dwindling resources should be put to more effective use.

17. The Centre had not carried out enough activities since its establishment to justify the attempt to obtain funding. The Centre had its headquarters in Doha, but was not a regional centre, as mandated by the General Assembly, but rather a national centre employed by the Qatari authorities in the service of their agenda of supporting non-governmental organizations and opposition elements in the States of the region in order to sow chaos and division and lay waste to their societies. For all those reasons, her delegation had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it; she urged all other delegations to do the same.

18. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said she was disappointed that one delegation had found it necessary to politicize the resolution. The United Status delegation would vote in favour and encouraged other delegations to do the same.

19. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.52/Rev.1.*

[1] The delegations of Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Jamaica, Paraguay, Peru, Sudan and United Arab Emirates subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to vote in favour of the resolution; and the delegation of Australia that it had intended to vote against.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania. Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon,, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic People's Republiic of Korea, Namibia, Togo and Zimbabwe.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.*[2]

21. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that Japan had voted in favour of the resolution and supported the activities of the Centre, but remained concerned about the programme budget implications.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.58: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

22. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

23. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Somalia, Swaziland, Vanuatu and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

24. The draft resolution requested the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to support, and Governments to cooperate with, the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order in the discharge of his mandate.

25. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Dominican Republic, Kenya, Saint Lucia, Senegal and United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

26. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.58.

27. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) asked which delegation had requested the recorded vote.

28. **The Chair** said that the recorded vote had been requested by the delegation of Lithuania, on behalf of the European Union.

29. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was necessary to work towards a democratic and equitable international order and the

[2] The delegations of Djibouti and Paraguay subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

issues raised in the draft resolution required careful analysis and action by all nations. The European Union had been founded on a determination to promote peace and stability and to build a world based on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law. However, the member States of the European Union remained of the view that many elements of the draft resolution extended far beyond the scope of the United Nations human rights agenda and therefore they would vote against it.

30. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.58.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Abstaining:

Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru and Samoa.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.3/67/L.58 was adopted by 120 votes to 54, with 5 abstentions.*[3]

32. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that the United States had voted against the resolution because the text did not accurately reflect international legal principles and did not advance human rights. The resolution challenged the sovereign right of all States to freely conduct their economic relations and protect their legitimate national interests. International development was a critical element of United States foreign policy; nevertheless the country remained concerned about the resolution's reference to the right to development. It was not appropriate to use any criteria relating to the right to development as a basis for consideration of an international legal standard of a binding nature. In addition, markets should operate freely, and countries should work together to create a more favourable investment climate instead of relying on Governments and international institutions to direct private capital.

33. Development assistance was not best used to distribute or redistribute wealth, but to assist countries in their efforts to attract private capital flows and participate in global trade. In the Monterrey Consensus, the international community had acknowledged that there was a role for developed countries to assist developing countries in achieving

[3] The delegation of Malaysia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

the types of structural reforms that would invite foreign direct investment. She called on groups such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) to grant preferential treatment to developing economies. While her delegation had reservations about the resolution and its treatment of development-related issues, there should be no doubt that the United States was committed to aiding global development efforts. The United States encouraged all countries to invest in a better future for their citizens by pursuing an approach to development that respected human rights, involved local stakeholders, promoted transparency and accountability and built the institutions underpinning sustainable democracy.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.59: Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity

34. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

35. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Myanmar, Swaziland, Uganda and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burkina Faso, China, the Dominican Republic, Kenya and Sri Lanka had become sponsors.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.59 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.60/Rev.1: The right to food

38. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

39. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that Bahrain, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Guyana, Iceland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Palau, Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland and Thailand had joined the sponsors. The full enjoyment of the right to food remained a utopia for many, despite its recognition in human rights instruments and declarations. The food crisis had caused a dramatic increase in the number of people suffering from hunger — currently estimated at over 870 million — most of whom lived in developing countries. The draft resolution called upon the United Nations funds and programmes, the international financial institutions and States to take the necessary measures to end the food crisis, ensure food security and guarantee everyone the right to food.

40. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom had joined the sponsors.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.60/Rev.1 was adopted.*

42. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the annual resolution because of its continuing support of efforts to achieve worldwide food security. However, it was disappointed that the text continued to employ language that distracted from larger issues at play. Statements on trade negotiations were inappropriate for the Committee to address as they were beyond both its expertise and its subject matter. Furthermore, the resolution would in no way modify her Government's commitments or those of any other Government vis-à-vis existing trade agreements or the mandates of ongoing trade negotiations. Her delegation was pleased that the text underlined the important link between the empowerment of women and the progressive realization of the right to food in the context of national food security.

43. The use of the term "global food crisis" detracted from more important challenges such as long-term conflicts or lack of strong governing institutions that could contribute significantly to the recurring state of regional food insecurity, yet those issues had not been mentioned in the resolution. A well-balanced text would refer not only to the actions of donor nations and investors, but also to the responsibilities of

countries receiving assistance, namely, accountability, transparency, good governance and creating a climate conducive to investment in agriculture.

44. Her Government supported the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living as recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; joining the consensus on the draft resolution did not imply recognition of any change in the current state of conventional or customary international law regarding rights related to food. While the goal was to ensure that everyone had adequate access to food, the right to food was not an enforceable obligation. The references in the draft resolution to the right to food were interpreted in the light of article 2, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, in which the States parties undertook to progressively achieve the full realization of economic, social and cultural rights to the extent they had assumed such obligations. While her Government was the world's largest food aid donor, it did not concur with any reading of the draft resolution that would suggest that States had particular extraterritorial obligations arising from the right to food.

45. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that her delegation had joined the consensus but had concerns with some aspects of the draft resolution. The TRIPS agreement contained no reference to the concepts of food security and the right to food. Her delegation interpreted paragraph 31 of the draft resolution to mean that it encouraged WTO members to consider the manner in which they implemented TRIPS but did not suggest that Member States should make substantive interpretations of the TRIPS agreement or instruct WTO members on how to implement the agreement. Her Government saw nothing in the agreement that prevented States from pursuing the right to food or food security. Canada supported the progressive realization of the right to food as part of the right to an adequate standard of living.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.61/Rev.1: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

46. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

47. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico) said that Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), had joined the sponsors.

48. The broad support for the resolution clearly conveyed the international community's commitment to respect for human rights, international humanitarian law and international refugee law in the context of the fight against terrorism. It was the first draft resolution in which the international community had addressed the topic of remotely piloted aircraft and sought international agreement regarding their use.

49. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Lebanon, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.61/Rev.1 was adopted.*

51. **Mr.** Masood **Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in the interest of moving forward on the issue. However, the resolution did not fully reflect established legal opinion and norms on the use of armed drones for extra-territorial strikes on the territories of Member States. He welcomed the inclusion in the text, for the first time, of references to the use of unmanned aircraft for counter-terrorism; to the need to reach agreement on legal questions pertaining to the use of such aircraft; and to the imperative of ensuring accountability in the event of breaches of obligations under international human rights law.

52. It had been disturbing to discover that the use of armed drones was increasing, according to the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism. The use of drones violated international law and human rights law and had violated Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The well-established humanitarian principles of distinction, proportionality and precaution were not being observed in the asymmetric war against terrorism, with obvious geographical disjunction between the location of drone strikes and the primary battlefield. Under international humanitarian law and international human rights law, it was not justifiable to launch strikes in the context of non-international armed conflict in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border area. Drone strikes put all Pakistanis at risk and were counterproductive: the killing of civilians in an inhumane manner incited hatred and radicalized more people. His delegation urged the Special Rapporteur to make stronger recommendations in his final report that would regiment the use of drones more strictly in order to save civilians from death, injury and disability; and to suggest practical measures to advance the debate in United Nations forums on the legality of armed drone use and on their disastrous humanitarian and human rights consequences. Pakistan called for immediate cessation of illegal drone strikes in its territory.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.62/Rev.1: Protection of migrants

53. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

54. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico) said that Bangladesh, Belarus, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mali, Morocco, Nicaragua, Philippines, Portugal and Uganda had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution reflected the Organization-wide consensus on addressing the protection of migrants in a balanced manner and integrating international migration into the post-2015 development agenda. The text acknowledged the responsibilities of origin, transit and destination countries in promoting and protecting the human rights of all migrants independent of their migratory status and highlighted the universal character of those rights, which States were required to respect at all times.

55. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Belize, Brazil, Costa Rica, Malawi, Tajikistan and Tunisia had become sponsors.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.62/Rev.1 was adopted.*

57. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the resolution and appreciate the efforts of the main sponsor, Mexico, for the constructive negotiations and the progress made. Her delegation would provide its full explanation of position, which would address certain points raised during consultations, to the Secretariat.

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.18/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.21/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.18/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

58. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution provided for a comprehensive study on cybercrime to be conducted by the open-ended intergovernmental expert group. If the General Assembly were to adopt the resolution, additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $235,300 would be required to convene one intergovernmental expert group meeting in Vienna for a total of 8 meetings, with interpretation services in the six official languages. The documentation requirements would include pre-session documentation and one report of the expert group meeting in the six official languages. Those resources would also provide for two months of a professional post at the P-2 level and two months of two general service posts. It was estimated that additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $634,600 would be required for translation and dissemination of the 287-page comprehensive study on cybercrime in the six official languages. Lastly, adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any appropriation for the programme budget for the 2012-2013 biennium.

59. **Mr. Cardi** (Italy) said that crime had a direct impact on all Member States without discrimination, affecting human welfare, State stability, economic growth and social development. A common, holistic and global response was therefore needed to combat the scourge. After several rounds of transparent and constructive informal consultations, several improvements had been made and such important issues as the elimination and prevention of all forms of violence against women and girls; prevention of criminal activities, including terrorism, in the tourism sector; smuggling of migrants; support for the United

Nations Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery; combating trafficking in persons for the purpose of extracting organs; and the need to improve the financial situation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime had been incorporated into the text.

60. After consensus had been reached, Indonesia had raised concerns about paragraph 17. Italy was grateful for the flexibility and spirit of compromise of that country, which had joined the consensus. The paragraph in question contained neutral and balanced language, with several clauses that fairly reflected the interests of each Member State. In future, his delegation would remain willing to consider improvements to that or any other part of the resolution to address concerns countries might have. He was confident that all Member States would find their views reflected in the draft and looked forward to their support.

61. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Niger, Turkey and United Arab Emirates had become sponsors.

62. **Mr. Percaya** (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that his delegation would support the consensus on the draft resolution but had a strong reservation concerning the reference to the Financial Action Task Force in paragraph 17. His Government supported common efforts to combat transnational organized crime and had participated in multilateral initiatives such as the Global Counterterrorism Forum, the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Counter-Terrorism Task Force. The nature of such crime required inclusive global cooperation which acknowledged States' varying capacities and the challenges they faced. The recommendations and interpretative note of the Financial Action Task Force, however, had been produced by its members only. Their inclusion in the draft resolution was tantamount to their imposition on States which were not members, in violation of the principle of the sovereign equality of States enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

63. His Government had adopted an act on the prevention of terrorist financing in 2013, with a view to implementing the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The act authorized law enforcement bodies to trace transactions by individuals or entities suspected of involvement with terrorism. The Financial Action Task Force, however, refused to acknowledge his Government's efforts to counter terrorist financing. It should take a more constructive approach, offering solutions and assistance to States rather than undermining their efforts.

64. Since Indonesia was a democratic country which upheld the rule of law, his Government must respect the principle of due process when freezing terrorist assets. Failure to do so would violate the Constitution and the principle of respect for human rights enshrined in the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

65. **Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that his Government was committed to strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme. His delegation had engaged in the consultations on the draft resolution and had joined the consensus, but still had a strong reservation concerning the unnecessary reference to the Financial Action Task Force in paragraph 17. That reference could have been deleted without changing the sense of the paragraph.

66. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted.*

67. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution but had a reservation about the twentieth preambular paragraph. Although transnational organized crime negatively affected human rights, the rule of law and national stability and development, it had no impact on international peace and security.

68. With regard to the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph, her delegation did not recognize the existence of automatic links between crimes. To make such links was to be unaware of the universally recognized human rights principles of due process and the presumption of innocence. The links between terrorism and transnational organized crime were neither automatic nor permanent and should be analysed on a case-by-case basis.

69. It was claimed in the twenty-eighth preambular paragraph that States' actions against terrorism were a common and shared responsibility. No such responsibility, however, was mentioned in the

international or regional instruments relating to the fight against terrorism, nor was it possible in the absence of an internationally agreed definition of terrorism, including State terrorism.

70. Her delegation felt that terrorism should be addressed by the Sixth Committee and that the references to it exceeded the scope of the draft resolution. The terrorism mandate of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime was limited to helping States implement international legal instruments.

71. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation had sponsored the draft resolution, which reinforced the commitments made by Member States at the twenty-second session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and underlined the importance of implementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.21/Rev.1: Preventing and combating corrupt practices and the transfer of proceeds of corruption, facilitating asset recovery and returning such assets to legitimate owners, in particular to countries of origin, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

72. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

73. **Mr. Calderón** (Colombia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Australia, Canada, Chile, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Niger, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, South Sudan, Spain, Thailand, Vanuatu and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had become sponsors. He introduced an oral revision to the draft resolution: paragraph 10 should be deleted since its content was still under discussion.

74. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Liberia, Montenegro, the Russian Federation, Senegal and Swaziland had joined the sponsors.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

76. **Ms. Sigrist** (Switzerland) said that the terms of reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption stipulated that the Mechanism should be transparent and inclusive. Her delegation therefore regretted that that requirement was not reflected in the text of the draft resolution.

77. **Mr. Nardi** (Liechtenstein) said that his delegation welcomed the improvements to the text, in which more importance was attached to the human rights dimension of the fight against corruption than in the previous year's resolution. The draft resolution was the first condemnation by the international community of all forms of corruption at all levels, including through abuse of authority by government officials. So-called petty corruption disproportionately affected disadvantaged groups. He hoped that the draft resolution would lead to a more elaborate approach to the human rights consequences of corruption in subsequent resolutions.

78. **Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the term "good governance" in paragraph 5 could be synonymous with the concept of proper management of public affairs and property, which had been accepted during the negotiations on the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Good governance should thus not be construed as a new concept.

79. It was also premature to establish a general link between all aspects of corruption and human rights; the matter needed further consideration and his delegation maintained its reservation about references to such a link.

80. **Mr. Escalante Hasbún** (El Salvador) said that his delegation regretted the deletion of paragraph 10. Since corruption threatened democratic governance, the rule of law, social and economic development and stability, his Government gave a high priority to the fight against it. International cooperation and assistance were essential to establishing the solid institutions needed for the investigation and prosecution of corruption allegations. Developing countries should be the strategic allies of developed countries in the common fight against corruption.

81. His Government had participated in mechanisms for the review of compliance with the Inter-American Convention against Corruption and within the United Nations framework. It had pioneered country visits in those contexts because review processes depended on openness among peer States. The report which it had produced through the Inter-American Convention

against Corruption compliance review mechanism was in the public domain.

82. Civil society should participate in initiatives to improve transparency and fight corruption not only because of its potential contribution to the achievement of their objectives but also because it was entitled to accountability from both the public and private sectors; it was the largest source of wealth for those sectors and lost many development benefits if they were corrupt. He urged all delegations to ensure that civil society participation was promoted in future resolutions. Such participation should be the theme of the sixth session of the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, with a view to the participation of civil society organizations as observers in the working groups linked to the Convention, thus enhancing the Convention's implementation and allowing delegations to reaffirm their commitment to transparency in their deliberations.

83. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/68/128).

84. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 109: International drug control (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.19/Rev.1)

85. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

86. **Ms. Morgan** (Mexico) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, the Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Guyana, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and United States of America had become sponsors.

87. She asked the secretariat to correct the twelfth preambular paragraph by deleting the words "illicit use" and replacing them with "use and abuse".

88. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Ireland, Liberia, Lithuania, Malawi, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Vanuatu had become sponsors.

89. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.19/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

90. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution but reiterated its opposition to the claim made in paragraphs 23 and 24 that automatic links existed among crimes or between terrorism and transnational organized crime.

91. **Ms. Hampe** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union, emphasized the importance to Member States of the 2016 special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem. The European Union looked forward to the recommendations of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs following the high-level review of the progress made in the implementation by Member States of the Political Declaration and Plan of Action on International Cooperation towards an Integrated and Balanced Strategy to Counter the World Drug Problem, to be held at the Commission's fifty-seventh session in March 2014. The Commission was the United Nations body primarily responsible for drug control and should take the lead in the preparations for the special session. The European Union recognized the cross-cutting nature of the world drug problem, its consequences for health, human rights and development, and the need for participation by stakeholders, including civil society, in the preparations for the special session.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.